

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

Shimon Weisberger, individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

C.A. No:

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

-v.-

Stevens Business Service Inc. and  
John Does 1-25,

Defendant(s).

**COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff Shimon Weisberger (hereinafter "Plaintiff") brings this Class Action Complaint by and through his attorneys, Stein Saks, PLLC against Defendant Stevens Business Service, Inc. (hereinafter "Defendant SBS"), individually and on behalf of a class of all others similarly situated, pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, based upon information and belief of Plaintiff's counsel, except for allegations specifically pertaining to Plaintiff, which are based upon Plaintiff's personal knowledge.

**INTRODUCTION**

1. Congress enacted the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA" or the "Act") in 1977 in response to the "abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors." 15 U.S.C. §1692(a). At that time, Congress was concerned that "abusive debt collection practices contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to material instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy."

*Id.* Congress concluded that "existing laws...[we]re inadequate to protect consumers," and that "'the effective collection of debts" does not require "misrepresentation or other abusive debt collection practices." 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692(b) & (c).

2. Congress explained that the purpose of the Act was not only to eliminate abusive debt collection practices, but also to "insure that those debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged." *Id.* § 1692(e). After determining that the existing consumer protection laws were inadequate. *Id.* § 1692(b), Congress gave consumers a private cause of action against debt collectors who fail to comply with the Act. *Id.* § 1692k.

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

3. The Court has jurisdiction over this class action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et. seq. The Court has pendent jurisdiction over any state law claims in this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1337(a).

4. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b)(2) as this is where a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred and this is where Plaintiff resides.

#### **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

5. Plaintiff brings this class action on behalf of a class of New York consumers under § 1692 et seq. of Title 15 of the United States Code, commonly referred to as the Fair Debt Collections Practices Act ("FDCPA"), and

6. Plaintiff is seeking damages and declaratory relief.

**PARTIES**

7. Plaintiff is a resident of the State of New York, County of Kings, and resides at 1568 57<sup>th</sup> St., Brooklyn, NY 11219.

8. Defendant SBS is a "debt collector" as the phrase is defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692(a)(6) and as used in the FDCPA with an address at 175 Cabot Street, Suite 415, Lowell, Massachusetts 01854.

9. Upon information and belief, Defendant SBS is a company that uses the mail, telephone, and facsimile and regularly engages in business the principal purpose of which is to attempt to collect debts alleged to be due another.

10. John Does 1-25, are fictitious names of individuals and businesses alleged for the purpose of substituting names of Defendants whose identities will be disclosed in discovery and should be made parties to this action.

**CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

11. Plaintiffs bring this claim on behalf of the following case, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and 23(b)(3).

12. The Class consists of:

- a. all individuals with addresses in the State of New York;
- b. to whom Defendant SBS sent a collection letter attempting to collect a consumer debt;
- c. that deceptively stated that both the original creditor and the debt collector would report to the credit bureaus;
- d. which letter was sent on or after a date one (1) year prior to the filing of this action and on or before a date twenty-one (21) days after the filing of this action.

13. The identities of all class members are readily ascertainable from the records of Defendant and those companies and entities on whose behalf it attempts to collect debts and/or has purchased debts.

14. Excluded from the Plaintiff Class are the Defendant and all officers, members, partners, managers, directors and employees of the Defendant and their respective immediate families, and legal counsel for all parties to this action, and all members of their immediate families.

15. There are questions of law and fact common to the Plaintiff Class, which common issues predominate over any issues involving only individual class members. The principal issue is whether the Defendant's written communications to consumers, in the forms attached as Exhibits A, violate 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e, 1692f.

16. The Plaintiff's claims are typical of the class members, as all are based upon the same facts and legal theories. The Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Plaintiff Class defined in this complaint. The Plaintiff has retained counsel with experience in handling consumer lawsuits, complex legal issues, and class actions, and neither the Plaintiff nor his attorneys have any interests, which might cause them not to vigorously pursue this action.

17. This action has been brought, and may properly be maintained, as a class action pursuant to the provisions of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure because there is a well-defined community interest in the litigation:

- a. **Numerosity:** The Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the Plaintiff Class defined above is so numerous that joinder of all members would be impractical.

- b. **Common Questions Predominate:** Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Plaintiff Class and those questions predominate over any questions or issues involving only individual class members. The principal issue is whether the Defendant's written communications to consumers, in the forms attached as Exhibit A violate 15 U.S.C. § 1692e, 1692f.
- c. **Typicality:** The Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Plaintiff Class. The Plaintiff and all members of the Plaintiff Class have claims arising out of the Defendants' common uniform course of conduct complained of herein.
- d. **Adequacy:** The Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Plaintiff Class insofar as Plaintiff has no interests that are adverse to the absent members of the Plaintiff Class. The Plaintiff is committed to vigorously litigating this matter. Plaintiff has also retained counsel experienced in handling consumer lawsuits, complex legal issues, and class actions. Neither the Plaintiff nor his counsel have any interests which might cause them not to vigorously pursue the instant class action lawsuit.
- e. **Superiority:** A class action is superior to the other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy because individual joinder of all members would be impracticable. Class action treatment will permit a large number of similarly situated persons to prosecute their common claims in a single forum efficiently and without unnecessary duplication of effort and expense that individual actions would engender.

18. Certification of a class under Rule 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is also appropriate in that the questions of law and fact common to members of the Plaintiff Class predominate over any questions affecting an individual member and in that a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.

19. Depending on the outcome of further investigation and discovery, Plaintiff may, at the time of class certification motion, seek to certify a class(es) only as to particular issues pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(4).

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

20. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates and incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs numbered above herein with the same force and effect as if the same were set forth at length herein.

21. Some time prior to December 2, 2020, an obligation was allegedly incurred to National Grid fka Keyspan NY.

22. The National Grid fka Keyspan NY obligation arose out of an alleged debt for transactions primarily for personal, family or household purposes, specifically utility services.

23. The alleged National Grid fka Keyspan NY obligation is a "debt" as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

24. National Grid fka Keyspan NY is a "creditor" as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(4).

25. Defendant SBS contracted with National Grid fka Keyspan NY to collect the alleged debt.

26. Defendant collects and attempts to collect debts incurred or alleged to have been incurred for personal, family or household purposes on behalf of creditors using the United States Postal Services, telephone and internet.

*Violation December 2, 2020 Collection Letter*

27. On or about December 2, 2020, Defendant sent the Plaintiff a collection letter (the "Letter") regarding the alleged debt owed to National Grid fka Keyspan NY. A true and correct copy of the Letter is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

28. The Letter states:

**Notification of Intent to Process Negative Credit Report**

We have not received your check in payment of this debt, and it is our obligation to inform you that a negative credit report, in your creditors name, will be made regarding your lack of cooperation with this matter. This report will be processed in approximately thirty days, unless full payment is received within twenty days from the date of this notification. Kindly give this matter the immediate consideration that it deserves.

29. The letter is unclear and deceptive if Defendant SBS will be doing the negative credit reporting or if the original creditor will be doing the negative credit reporting or if both the Defendant and the original creditor would be doing the negative reporting.

30. The letter implies that Defendant SBS will be doing the reporting because Defendant is informing the Plaintiff of the details of the reporting, yet the letter also states that a negative credit report will be made in "your creditor's name" implying that the original creditor would also be reporting the negative credit information.

31. It is deceptive to state that two companies will report to the credit reporting agencies on the same debt.

32. Moreover, the letter intimidates and threatens the consumer by implying that his account information will be reported twice to the national credit reporting agencies.

33. Plaintiff incurred an informational injury as Defendant falsely asserted that the same debt would be reported twice to the national credit reporting agencies twice on the same debt.

34. In addition, the letter states that the negative credit reporting will be made “regarding your lack of cooperation with this matter,” implying that somehow the credit reporting will indicate “lack of cooperation.”

35. The negative credit reporting would not include details such as “lack of cooperation,” because it would only include basic indications regarding payment or lack thereof (or late payments) and to include such language in the collection letter is false and deceptive to the Plaintiff.

36. As a result of Defendant's deceptive, misleading and unfair debt collection practices, Plaintiff has been damaged.

**COUNT I**  
**VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT 15 U.S.C. §1692e**  
***et seq.***

37. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates and incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs above herein with the same force and effect as if the same were set forth at length herein.

38. Defendant's debt collection efforts attempted and/or directed towards the Plaintiff violated various provisions of the FDCPA, including but not limited to 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

39. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692e, a debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt.

40. Defendant violated § 1692e:

- a. As the Letter it is open to more than one reasonable interpretation, at least one of which is inaccurate.
- b. By making a false and misleading representation in violation of §1692e(10).

41. By reason thereof, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff for judgment that Defendant's conduct violated Section 1692e et seq. of the FDCPA, and Plaintiff is entitled to an award of actual damages, statutory damages, costs and attorneys' fees.

**COUNT I**

**VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT 15 U.S.C. §1692f  
*et seq.***

44. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates and incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs above herein with the same force and effect as if the same were set forth at length herein.
45. Defendant's debt collection efforts attempted and/or directed towards the Plaintiff violated various provisions of the FDCPA, including but not limited to 15 U.S.C. § 1692f.
46. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692f, a debt collector may not use any unfair or unconscionable means in connection with the collection of any debt.
47. Defendant violated this section by threatening to use language in a negative credit reporting that would not be used.
48. By reason thereof, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff for judgment that Defendant's conduct violated Section 1692f et seq. of the FDCPA, actual damages, statutory damages, costs and attorneys' fees.

**DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY**

42. Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff Shimon Weisberger, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, demands judgment from Defendant SBS as follows:

1. Declaring that this action is properly maintainable as a Class Action and certifying Plaintiff as Class representative, and Raphael Deutsch, Esq. as Class Counsel;
2. Awarding Plaintiff and the Class statutory damages;
3. Awarding Plaintiff and the Class actual damages;
4. Awarding Plaintiff costs of this Action, including reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses;
5. Awarding pre-judgment interest and post-judgment interest; and
6. Awarding Plaintiff and the Class such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully Submitted,

**STEIN SAKS, PLLC**

*/s/Raphael Deutsch*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Raphael Deutsch, Esq.  
285 Passaic Street  
Hackensack, NJ 07601  
Tel: (201) 282-6500  
Fax: (201) 282-6501  
[rdeutsch@steinsakslegal.com](mailto:rdeutsch@steinsakslegal.com)